

LUCIFER.



THE LIGHT-BEARER.

ENTERED AT THE CHICAGO POSTOFFICE AS SECOND-CLASS MAIL MATTER.

PRICE FIVE CENTS.

CHICAGO, MARCH 29, E. M. 306 [C. E. 1906].

WHOLE NO. 1062

HEROES.

[New York, Feb. 12, 1906.—*My Dear Brother Harman:* The announcement of your incarceration makes most painfully realistic your heroic life-story, and my sympathy and loving admiration find something of expression in the following lines copied from a clipping lately sent me and which most truly picture your pure and noble spirit. Reverently yours, ERNEST WINNE.]

When I think sometimes of what wondrous fame
Hath fallen upon men of noisy deeds,
Of laurel flung for every drop that bleeds
And grateful nations busy with a name,
I think of those who, deaf to praise or blame,
Labor in silence for their brothers' needs,
Sowing in darkness those immortal seeds
To one day blossom in men's souls like flame.
Ah, these unrecognized, unhailed, denied!
These heroes, of what land or age they be,
Who mutely anguish at the task undone—
These wonderful, strong Christs, not crucified
On a high place for all the world to see,
But striving on unnoted and alone!

—Theodosia Garrison.

OUR DESPOTIC POSTAL CENSORSHIP.

We recur with much reluctance to the despotic censorship which is growing up in the postoffice department under cover of well-meant congressional legislation for the suppression of vice and fraud. The subject cannot be neglected while that crude and careless legislation remains upon the statute books unamended. For this censorship, already destructive of some of the legitimate postal rights of some persons, is becoming more and more expansive in scope and despotic in execution.

The particular instance regarding which we are about to submit the facts, relates, as did a previous one, to the Chicago periodical known as LUCIFER, which the postoffice department is endeavoring to suppress on the manifestly false pretense that it is an obscene publication. On the same pretense and by the same influence, the editor, Mr. Moses Harman, has been imprisoned through the machinery of the federal courts.

LUCIFER is devoted in good faith to the propagation of its editor's opinions regarding sex relationships. Although these opinions are contrary to ours, we conceive that they may nevertheless be entitled to respectful consideration, and we therefore demand for them the same freedom of expression that we enjoy for our own. They are, indeed, hostile to the perpetuation of certain ecclesiastical and social conventionalities, but only a false witness or a moral pervert would deliberately pronounce them obscene. The product of a philosophical and not a salacious mind, they present for rational thought questions of human welfare which demand uncensored expression.

But the vital question presented by the particular circumstances to be here considered, is not whether LUCIFER's opinions and ours, or its opinions and anybody else's, are at variance. It is not whether one kind of opinion or another shall be suppressed. It is not whether obscenity shall be excluded from the mails, nor even whether LUCIFER is actually guilty of obscene utterances. The vital question to the American people in this and all similar cases is whether any person shall, upon any pretense whatever, be deprived of his liberty or his property, so far as either depends upon the use of the mails, without a fair trial and in accordance with public law and unconceded precedents. It is the old question of "administrative process" in a new form.

That the right to use the mails depends, under the act of Congress as it now exists, upon the mere whim of administrative officers we have already proved. We purpose now to confirm that proof with additional evidence. At the same time we shall demonstrate specifically the following assertions:

1. Any periodical, though it contains nothing obscene, is subject to exclusion peremptorily from the mails as a purveyor of obscenity, upon the mere order of administrative officials of the post-office department.

2. Exclusion orders are made ostensibly in accordance with precedents of the department created by rulings in particular cases upon what constitutes obscenity; but these precedents are secret, and by refusing to define their limitations upon request the department prevents publishers from guarding against the penalties of orders of exclusion.

3. Publishers whose periodicals are so excluded are accorded no protection by the courts against unjust exclusions, not even though the exclusion be made in manifest bad faith. As the law stands, the postmaster general's dictum, right or wrong, and whether with good intent or evil intent, is absolute.

4. In practice the postoffice department excludes periodicals from the mails for publishing articles denounced as obscene, which in fact are not obscene.

5. The law as it now stands affords officials of the postoffice department a degree of opportunity for corrupt discrimination in excluding periodicals, which it is unsafe to repose in any official and which ought to be carefully guarded against by Congress.

I.

About the middle of August last we were advised that the issue of LUCIFER of August 3 had been excluded from the mails by postal order. According to our information, the matter specified as objectionable was in a paragraph of each of two indicated articles.

The first of these paragraphs was clearly not obnoxious to the law, unless President Roosevelt's observations on race suicide were obnoxious to it; the second was no more so, unless a book it named by title is on the postal index expurgatorius. We should have no hesitation in republishing both paragraphs for the purpose of showing their innocence, were it not for the fact that the postoffice department has them now on its index expurgatorius. This fact alone, were we to republish them here, would subject this issue of "The Public" to the risk of exclusion from the mails by order of the post-office department, and without possibility of protection from the courts.

Upon examining the articles in question we wrote, August 12, 1905, to the Chicago postmaster as follows:

Mr. Moses Harman, the publisher of LUCIFER the Light-Bearer, which is entered at the Chicago postoffice, writes us to the effect that his issue of August 3d was submitted to your office for mailing; that your office advised that the first two articles of the issue were unavailable under section 497 of the "Postal Laws and Regulations"; and that the question is now before the department at Washington awaiting its decision, the issue of LUCIFER for August 3d being meanwhile practically denied circulation through the mails.

The first article he indicates is signed . . . and the second purports to be an article in the . . . by . . . I have read the articles with a good deal of care, and fail to find in them anything that can possibly, either in thought or phrase, fall within what I should suppose would be considered a fair interpretation of the section of the "Postal Laws and Regulations" referred to above.

If the articles were in harmony with my own views, I should never think of refusing them admission to my columns, although I am extremely careful, entirely apart from any consideration of the postal laws and regulations, to avoid giving offense with reference to the general subject with

which these articles are allied. I can see no reason whatever for refusing them admission to any publication on any other ground than that, as in my case, they are out of harmony with its editorial policy. I am therefore constrained to believe that there must be some mistake or misunderstanding. It does not seem to me possible that your office would take the action which the publisher of LUCIFER tells me has been taken respecting these articles.

May I therefore respectfully ask you to inform me of the facts so far as your office is concerned?

The reply of the Chicago postmaster, promptly made and bearing the date of August 14, was as follows:

Replying to yours of August 12, concerning the publication LUCIFER, the issue of August 3 contains obscene literature, judged by the precedent set by the department at Washington in its rulings on this publication. The alleged objectionable matter is found in the . . . paragraph,* beginning . . . in the . . . column of page . . . also in the . . . paragraph from the bottom of the same column, beginning . . . In this paragraph a pamphlet is advertised which contains obscene matter.

If the matter is not obscene in the meaning of the law, the ruling of the department at Washington will render the matter mailable, and no damage will result to the publication.

There has been no misunderstanding on the part of this office in its action on this issue of the publication. This action is entirely within the departmental instructions, and so far in the history of this publication the action of this office has been upheld by the department.

The paragraphs specified in the postmaster's letter, the specific reference to which we omit for reasons explained in the footnote, were the same paragraphs as those to which our attention had been originally called. The second one was held to be objectionable only because it named a book which is on the postal index expurgatorius.

This letter from the Chicago postmaster throws some light on the indifference of the postal authorities to personal rights. "If the matter is not obscene," calmly writes the Chicago postmaster (doubtless by the hand of a bureaucratic subordinate), "the rulings of the department at Washington will render the matter mailable, and no damage will result to the publication." No damage will result to the publication! A whole issue of a publication may be stopped while a bureau at Washington leisurely considers whether it contains obscenity, and if the bureau's decision is favorable, "no damage will result to the publication"! This discloses a queer notion of the nature of newspaper property. However, as to our inquiry the Chicago postmaster's letter was as specific as could be required, and we awaited the final action of the department upon the postmaster's order of exclusion.

Meanwhile the Chicago postmaster had found it necessary, in accordance with the precedents of the department, to exclude also the issue of LUCIFER of August 17.

In this instance the accusation, as reported to us, was plainly imaginary. It rested in part upon the republication of an editorial from the "Woman's Journal," of Boston, the national woman suffrage organ, and one of the purest and most reputable periodicals in the United States, and in part upon an extract from an official report of the agricultural department of the United States government.

We, thereupon, wrote this letter, dated August 26, to the Chicago postmaster:

Thank you for your prompt, courteous and full reply of August 14 to mine of August 12, in which I had inquired relative to denial of mail service to the edition of the paper LUCIFER of August 3.

In one respect you misunderstood me. It was not my intention to imply that your office is acting recklessly with reference to the policy of the department, or contrary to departmental instructions. I was only seeking information as to the policy, rulings and instructions of the department as applied by you in a particular case.

And now I must trouble you again in the same way. I am informed that the issue of LUCIFER of August 17 also has been refused mail service, and that the refusal is based on the charge that an article reproduced in it from the "Woman's Journal," of Boston, and written by one of the editors of that paper, Alice Stone Blackwell, is unmailable under section 497 of "Postal Laws and Regulations." As the "Woman's Journal" is the principal journalistic representative of the woman suffrage movement in the United States, and is everywhere respected as a pure and able publication, and Miss Blackwell is a woman of national reputation with a

* We omit the specific references made in the postmaster's letter, because their inclusion here might subject this issue of "The Public" to suppression by order of the postal censor. The same act of Congress by authority of which LUCIFER was censored for publishing those articles provides also that "notice of any kind giving information, directly or indirectly, where or how, or of whom or by what means an 'obscene' . . . publication of an indecent character" "may be obtained" is itself non-mailable matter." Since the censors have already decided that the articles in question are obscene and indecent, they might decide that the naming of them by title and page, in connection with the name of the publication in which they appeared, is a notice making the paper publishable and mailable under the statute and therefore subject to suppression. Were they to so decide, they could suppress this issue of "The Public," and we should be without protection or redress or any power to get a judicial trial.

stainless character, this action of your office is of peculiar importance and of exceptional public concern.

The matter also concerns me personally, for in entire good faith I also have reproduced an extract from Miss Blackwell's article. Whether the part I have reproduced includes any of the article to which you are said to object I cannot positively know until I learn definitely from you the particular part or parts of that article (the whole and every part of which seem to me a thoroughly clean and just criticism of the present postal administration) to which postal objection is made and for the republication of which the mail service is denied to LUCIFER of August 17—if such service has been denied on account of anything contained in Miss Blackwell's article.

Both for my own guidance, therefore, and also for legitimate public use, will you kindly indicate to me specifically, in such way as you think proper, what are the grounds for the exclusion from the mails of the edition of LUCIFER of August 17?

The postmaster's reply, bearing date of August 29, was as follows:

Replying to yours of August 26, three pounds of the publication LUCIFER, of the issue of August 17, were offered for mailing at this office, and the copies are held, awaiting decision by the department at Washington as to whether or not they are mailable under Sec. 497, P. L. & R.

The matter to which the attention of the department has been especially drawn by this office is the article at the head of the . . . column of page . . . , and the . . . lines at the . . . of the . . . column of page . . . †

Judging by precedent, this matter is in violation of section 497, and under postal instructions it is the duty of this office to submit the matter to the department at Washington for a ruling.

Owing to the indefiniteness of this letter from the postmaster, we made the following further inquiry, in a letter to him bearing date of August 30:

Thank you for your reply of the 29th to mine of 26th, in re issue of LUCIFER of August 17.

You say that "the attention of the department has been especially drawn" by your office to "the article at the . . . of the . . . column of page . . . and the . . . lines at the . . . of the . . . column of page" As you qualify your statement by the word "especially," may I further ask whether you acted also on any other part of the article on page . . . or on any other article in the issue in question?

And if it would be proper for you to give it, I should like the following additional information regarding the objectionability of the article at the head of the . . . column of page . . . :

1. Does the objection apply to the use of the title of Dr. —'s book in the . . . line of that article?

2. Does it apply to the language of the comparison between mankind and horse kind in lines . . . and . . . of the text of the article?

3. Does it apply to the quotation in line . . . of the text of the article, purporting to be from page . . . of a "Special Report on Diseases of the Horse," prepared under the direction of Dr. D. E. Salmon, and issued by the bureau of animal industry in the United States department of agriculture?

4. Does it apply to the quotation in lines . . . and . . . of the text of the article in question, purporting to be from the text of the above described report of the agricultural department?

5. Does it apply to the use of the title of Dr. —'s book in the . . . line of the text of the article in question?

Noting what you say to the effect that the articles in question are in violation of section 497 according to precedent, and that it is your duty under postal instructions to submit them to the department for a ruling, I wish to assure you of my absolute confidence in your good faith and that of your office. Permit me also to apologize for presuming to interrogate you so minutely as I do in this letter. Believe me, I am far from desiring to annoy you, or your office, or the department. But it seems to me of the utmost importance that editors and the reading public should know the extent of the limitations that the rulings of the department are imposing upon editorial discussion, quotation, etc., and it is only to this end that I trouble you.‡

Following was the the Chicago postmaster's reply of September 1 to the foregoing letter:

Replying to yours of August 30, relative to the publication LUCIFER, I cannot answer your specific questions with a direct "yes" or "no." I see no necessity for this office to explain its objection to this printed matter in the manner you have prescribed. The article in question may be "obscene," within the meaning of the law. That is for the department at Washington to decide. To quote your statement, it may be "of the utmost importance that editors and the reading public should know the extent of the limitations that the rulings of the department are imposing upon editorial discussion, quotations, etc.," but it is not within the province of this office to interpret the law. That is the prerogative of the department at Washington. This office can only refer you to the statutes and to the rulings of the department in specific cases.

In answer to the first question of yours of August 30, all references to the book ". . ." were marked in the copy sent to the department by

† Indicating the articles containing quotation from United States Agricultural Report and two lines of the "Woman's Journal" article.

‡ Specific reference omitted for reasons stated in previous footnote.

§ Name of book omitted for reasons heretofore given. The book mentioned in the postmaster's letter is not the United States Agricultural Report, but Dr. —'s book entitled ". . ."



this office. These references are not necessarily objectionable. The quotation from the book may be.

Having been refused in the preceding letter the information we sought, and referred therein "to the rulings of the department in specific cases," we addressed the postmaster general in the following letter, dated September 6:

Will you kindly examine the inclosed correspondence between myself and the postmaster at Chicago and, if in your judgment proper to do so, favor me with the information which the Chicago postmaster does not regard it proper for his office to furnish?

To facilitate your examination of the inclosures, I describe them as follows:

1. My letter of August 26 asking (for legitimate public use) for a specification of the grounds for the Chicago postmaster's exclusion from the mails of the edition of the Chicago periodical *LUCIFER*, of August 17, 1905.

2. The postmaster's response of August 29, indicating the matter to which the attention of your department was "especially drawn" by the Chicago postmaster as furnishing grounds for the exclusion.

3. My reply of August 30, asking specific questions, with a view to ascertaining exactly, and all, the matter objected to in the edition of *LUCIFER* in question, the postmaster having qualified his response to my former letter with the word "especially," as you will observe by reference to the copy of his response inclosed.

4. The postmaster's reply of September 1, stating that he sees no necessity for explaining his objection to the printed matter in question in the manner I have requested, and referring to your department.

My specific requests of your department are:

First. Whether the Chicago postmaster, in denying mail service to the issue of *LUCIFER* of August 17, noted as objectionable any other part or parts of that issue than the parts described by him in his letters to me of August 29 and September 1. If so, what part or parts?

Second. Whether the objections he noted applied to the issue of *LUCIFER* in question, as indicated by any or all of those questions in my letter to him of August 30, which are therein distinguished by the numerals 2, 3 and 4.

As I stated in my letter of August 30 to the Chicago postmaster, it is no part of my purpose to annoy your department, or any branch of it, with impertinent inquiries. I may add that I have no intention of soliciting any information that the general public have no right to know. But I shall be greatly obliged if your department will give me the information solicited above, so far as it may be within the bounds of propriety, and, to save further inquiry from me, will be sufficiently specific with reference to any of my requests that you may think improper, as to assure me that the failure to reply is because they are improper and not because they are accidentally overlooked.

The reply to the foregoing letter was dated September 13, and came from the first assistant postmaster general, who wrote:

In reply to your letter of the 6th instant to the postmaster general, you are informed that this department cannot undertake to specify in detail the objectionable matter appearing in the issue of the periodical *LUCIFER*, of August 17, 1905, which caused the exclusion of that issue from the mails.

This reply was so obviously an attempt to evade responsibility, and so manifestly indicative of a disposition to censor the mails not only arbitrarily but secretly, that we renewed our inquiries. This seemed necessary in order to make sure that the foregoing letter was deliberately in execution of a policy of secret censorship instituted by the department, and not merely the irresponsible act of a careless first assistant.

Our letter renewing our previous inquiries was also addressed to the postmaster general. It bore date of September 18, and as will be noted from its reproduction below, it sought the information on the special ground that the department's decision had made a precedent, the limitations of which ought to be divulged upon application by persons likely to be affected by it in conducting their business:

I am in receipt of reply of the 13th by the first assistant postmaster general to my letter of inquiry of the 6th, in which the first assistant postmaster general advises me that your "department cannot undertake to specify in detail the objectionable matter appearing in the issue of the periodical *LUCIFER* of August 17, 1905, which caused the exclusion of that issue from the mails."

Since receiving that letter I am informed that your department has sustained the postmaster at Chicago in his exclusion of the issue of *LUCIFER* of August 17, and that this has been done because in that issue it published an editorial entitled "..."* and an article copied from the "Woman's Journal," entitled "..." Inasmuch as the matter has been finally decided by your department, and is no longer under advisement, I wish to ascertain the extent of your adjudication, for the purpose of understanding its effect as a precedent.

As to the article from the "Woman's Journal," your adjudication is sufficiently specific in one respect, namely, the ... lines at the top of the ... column of page ... of *LUCIFER* of August 17, and as to that I have no question to ask.

As to the other part of the same article, the matter about ... way down the ... column of page ... of *LUCIFER*, which you have adjudicated to be objectionable, will you kindly inform me whether or not your adjudication rests only or at all upon the naming there of the title of a book?

I should like also to know whether your adjudication as to the "Woman's Journal" article in *LUCIFER* rests upon anything else than the naming of that book, and upon the ... lines at the ... of the ... column of page ...

Finally, as to the article in *LUCIFER* entitled "..." it seems to me especially important, since the postmaster at Chicago advises me that he acts in these questions upon the precedents your department establishes, that I should know the full bearing of the precedent established with reference to this particular article. The article, as you will recall, mentions the title of a book, and quotes from an official report of the United States department of agriculture. Will you kindly inform me whether your adjudication as to this article rests upon the naming of the book, or the quotation from the agricultural department's report, or both?

Please understand me. I am not endeavoring to probe the mental processes whereby the conclusions of your department were arrived at. All I am asking for is the extent of the conclusions themselves, in so far as they go to make a precedent.

Regretting what seems to me to be the necessity for further troubling you in this matter, I am, etc.

The reply of the department to the foregoing letter confirmed the indications of the first assistant's letter of the 15th. It showed that arbitrary and secret censorship is a deliberate policy of the department; either that, or else that F. H. Hitchcock, first assistant postmaster general, deliberately misrepresented the department. For the reply, signed by F. H. Hitchcock as first assistant postmaster general, and dated September 27, was as follows:

Your letter of the 18th instant, addressed to the postmaster general, has been referred to this office for reply. With reference to your questions relative to certain objectionable articles which appeared in the issue of the publication *LUCIFER*, of August 17, you are informed that the position of the department in the matter was stated in a letter to you bearing date of the 18th instant.

We invite attention to the bureaucratic superciliousness of this reply to proper questions respectfully asked. The department refuses to answer further than by reference to its prior letter. In its prior letter it declined to "undertake to specify in detail the objectionable matter," etc. Now what had we asked? Observe the substance of our questions and the department's reply:

Question: Did the department's adjudication as to a certain part of a certain article "rest only or at all upon the naming there of the title of a book?"

Answer: The department "cannot undertake to specify in detail the objectionable matter."

Question: Did the department's adjudication as to the "Woman's Journal" article rest upon anything else than the name of a book and certain indicated lines?

Answer: The department "cannot undertake to specify in detail the objectionable matter."

Question: One of the indicated articles "mentions the title of a book, and quotes from an official report of the United States department of agriculture. Will you kindly inform me whether your adjudications as to this article rests upon the naming of the book, or the quotation from the agricultural department's report, or both?"

Answer: The department "cannot undertake to specify in detail the objectionable matter."

Soon after the foregoing correspondence we learned of the censorship by the postoffice department of a subsequent issue of *LUCIFER*, the issue of October 12. According to a still later issue of *LUCIFER*, the circumstances of this censorship were these: One of the articles in that issue of *LUCIFER*, to which the postoffice department was understood to have objected, was merely a catalogue of books. Among the authors were John Stuart Mill, August Bebel and other thinkers of reputation; and none of them is apparently obscene unless every serious discussion of the philosophy and physiology of sex is to be considered as in that abhorrent category. The other article contains a quotation from the London "Fortnightly Review," which includes one from Bernard Shaw's "Man and Superman," proposing pensions as a preventive of what President Roosevelt calls race suicide.

Upon learning of the suppression of this issue of *LUCIFER* we addressed the following letter of inquiry to the postmaster general, under date of October 20:

I am informed that the Chicago postmaster has excluded from the mails the issue of the Chicago paper named *LUCIFER*, of October 12, 1905, and that the exclusion is based upon an article on page ... first and ... columns, containing a descriptive catalogue of books, and upon an article on page ... second column, containing a quotation from Bernard Shaw's

*Titles of editorials are here omitted for precautionary reasons. See preceding footnotes.

†See preceding foot notes.



THE LIGHT-BEARER.

MOSES HARMAN, EDITOR AND PUBLISHER.

PUBLISHED FORTNIGHTLY AT 500 FULTON ST., CHICAGO, ILL.
TELEPHONE: ASHLAND 1727.

TERMS OF SUBSCRIPTION.

One year.....\$1.00 Three months.....25 cents
Six months.....50 cents Single copies.....5 cents
Hereafter Lucifer will not be sent to subscribers after expiration of subscription except by special request. Please compare number on your wrapper with whole number of paper, and if your subscription is about to expire notify us if you wish to continue to receive Lucifer.

EASTERN REPRESENTATIVE:

E. C. WALKER, 244 WEST 143D STREET, NEW YORK CITY.

LUCIFER: ITS MEANING AND PURPOSE.

LUCIFER—The planet Venus; so called from its brightness.—*Webster's Dictionary*.LUCIFEROUS—Giving light; affording light or the means of discovery.—*Same*.LUCIFIC—Producing light.—*Same*.LUCIFORM—Having the form of light.—*Same*.

The name Lucifer means Light-Bringing or Light-Bearing, and the paper that has adopted this name stands for Light against Darkness—for Reason against Superstition—for Science against Tradition—for Investigation and Enlightenment against Credulity and Ignorance—for Liberty against Slavery—for Justice against Privilege.

CONGRESS SHALL MAKE NO LAW RESPECTING AN ESTABLISHMENT OF RELIGION, OR PROHIBITING THE FREE EXERCISE THEREOF; OR ABRIDGING THE FREEDOM OF SPEECH, OR OF THE PRESS; OR THE RIGHT OF THE PEOPLE PEACEABLY TO ASSEMBLE, AND TO PETITION THE GOVERNMENT FOR A REDRESS OF GRIEVANCES.—*First Amendment to the Constitution of the United States.*

Letters for LUCIFER should be addressed to Moses Harman, 500 Fulton street, Chicago.

Money orders and drafts should be made payable to Moses Harman. Please do not send personal checks, as a discount is charged by the banks for collection.

The article on "Our Despotical Postal Censorship," by Louis F. Post, occupies so much of the space in this issue that much other matter to which we should like to give place is crowded out. But we feel that Mr. Post's able presentation of the case is of such importance that it should be given completely. "The Public" has published it in a neat and convenient shape. We have ordered a supply and are sure it will be circulated. The price is 3 cents a copy, 25 cents a dozen. But as in the case of the Wakeman Letter, the money, though important, is not of first consideration. If the pamphlets are placed where they will awaken thought and action the work will be well done, even though a part of the money invested is lost. Let those who can pay for the literature do so, but let no one refrain from assisting in the circulation because of lack of money. The work must go forward. Progress is being made and will continue, we are sure. Though forced to silence, the spirit of the imprisoned editor is felt by an increasing number, who would never have read his words had he remained at liberty.

A PIONEER IN THE CAUSE OF FREEDOM FOR WOMEN.

Susan B. Anthony—whose name, once so widely ridiculed and execrated, is now praised and honored—lived to see the cause for which she had labored a lifetime become respected. She experienced the petty persecution of the public press, such as that now endured by Emma Goldman and others. Her views on the equality of woman in the home and the nation, once so startling, are now so commonly indorsed that she has seemed almost to belong in the ranks of the conservatives. Nevertheless, she had experienced arrest and condemnation, and has had her writings censored by postal officials—and was not convinced of the erroneousness of her views by those weighty arguments.

In the presidential election of 1872 Miss Anthony cast a vote and for this crime, for this attack on the foundations of society, she was

arrested, tried and sentenced to pay a fine of \$100 and costs. "May it please your honor," she said, "I shall never pay a dollar of that unjust penalty." Nor was it paid by herself or any other person.

During a visit in Berlin she posted letters in the official envelopes of the suffrage association, which bore the motto, "No just government can be formed without the consent of the governed." In a few days an official brought back a large package, saying, "Such sentiments are not allowed to pass through the postoffice."

"In the quarters of one of the devotees at the old monastery of the Centosa, at Florence, there lies, on a small table, an open book, in which visitors register," says Elizabeth Cady Stanton, in her "Reminiscences." "On the occasion of Miss Anthony's visit the pen and ink proved so unpromising that her entire party declined this opportunity to make themselves famous, but she made the rebellious pen inscribe, 'Perfect equality for women, civil, political, religious. Susan B. Anthony, U. S. A.' Friends who visited the monastery next day, reported that lines had been drawn through this heretical sentiment."

Miss Anthony was a woman of "one idea"—so the world would say. I believe that she accomplished great good for women, and therefore for all humanity. "Who will rock the cradle when the women go to vote?" was anxiously asked of the suffragists. It was claimed that if a wife had the right to legally register an opinion at variance from that of her husband, the family would be disrupted, the home destroyed and society thrown into a state of chaos. Just as those who oppose a still wider freedom for women, their prototypes held that the love of father and mother for each other and for their children could not exist in freedom, unconscious that thus they most bitterly assailed human nature, and ignoring the fact that the home and the family can exist in their highest and their best only in the pure, sweet atmosphere of freedom and love. L. H.

DENIAL OF FREE DISCUSSION AN OUTRAGE.

It was with sincere sorrow that I heard of your father's being sent to Joliet. He goes there with a good conscience, however, which will probably make him happier, even in prison, than his persecutors deserve to be; and if anything can be done to soften his material hardships, I hope you will let me help.

The "Woman's Journal" will have an account of the matter this week, and will invite all who may be interested in helping to get a pardon, if possible, to communicate with the Free Speech League.

We do not agree in our theoretical ideas, but the denial of the right of free discussion of all sorts of theories is an outrage, and it is only a question of time when that right will be fully established. And I can heartily admire your and Mr. Harman's courage, even while differing with you in opinion. Yours with much sympathy,

ALICE STONE BLACKWELL.

A SAD CIVILIZATION.

MY DEAR LILLIAN HARMAN: The imprisonment of your father is an outrage. Is there no way that the friends of free speech can unite to urge his release? Like many another guiltless prisoner, he has the comfort of a clear conscience and of obedience to his sense of duty. It is a sad civilization that must incarcerate men like him. As the son of one who found happiness in prison walls, I congratulate you on a father worthy of such distinction for the sake of freedom and justice. Very sincerely yours,

WILLIAM LLOYD GARRISON.

Boston, Mass., March 20, 1906.

SAYS EDITOR'S PICTURE ADDS INTEREST.

By all means keep Mr. Harman's benign countenance in LUCIFER. If it takes extra fine paper, here are \$2 toward it, and I trust you will find many other contributors for this same purpose. Its presence in LUCIFER will not only add interest, but show to the world what kind of a man is in prison in the state of Illinois for upholding the most sacred rights of women. Very truly,

E. B. FOOTE.

120 Lexington Avenue, New York.

Great is Democracy! Under its palladium even the humblest of us has a voice. We are permitted to vote. We elect our public servants. Then we permit our good masters to select a committee to watch our appointees. Then we have a voters' league to keep an eye on the committee. Then we have a society to watch the voters' league. And so ad infinitum.—Selected.

A VICTIM OF THE POSTAL INQUISITION.

MOSES HARMAN, EDITOR OF LUCIFER.



Today Moses Harman is 75 years 5 months and 17 days old. He has served 31 days of his sentence to imprisonment for one year at hard labor.

His crime was the admission into LUCIFER of a serious discussion of the marital relations of men and women.

One of the two articles on which prosecution was based was written in criticism of LUCIFER and was published because the editor believes that only through free expression of opinion is the truth to be reached.

The other article was written by an elderly woman, a mother of several children—a grandmother as well—in advocacy of self-control by men and women.

Address personal letters to Moses Harman, care of Chaplain, State Penitentiary, Joliet, Ill. All letters pass through the chaplain's hands. Do not expect personal answers, as, according to the rules of the prison, a prisoner may write only one letter a month. However, a list of letters will be kept and published from time to time, so that the writers may know they were received.

★ ★ ★

The Free Speech League has issued a slip containing the following matter. It is designed to circulate in connection with the Open Letter, by T. B. Wakeman, and in other ways as well:

One year in prison, beginning March 1, 1906, is the sentence being served at Joliet, Ill., by Moses Harman, aged 75 years, teacher, preacher, editor, reformer; an earnest, honest, steadfast, brave, unflinching, Garrison-type of man—the last victim of ill-defined, misconstrued, much-abused obscenity laws; the last martyr for free press; the last to suffer "for opinion's sake."

The United States government ought to be letting him go, and asking his pardon for so gross a mistake in forgetting its fundamental constitution and principles, but this is "too much to expect," so the friends of the prisoner, for the sake of the government, to save their respect for it, will now ask a pardon for the prisoner who has committed no real offense. To this absurd extremity have we come at last that we must ask for a pardon for Harman.

All who can and will aid in the effort to atone for one of the first mistakes of a "free government" in the twentieth century will communicate with the Free Speech League, 175 Broadway, New York.

"Straws show how the wind blows." Here is the first sign that

a storm is brewing. In the "New York American's" February 22 report of the senate debate on pure food bill, by Mr. Julian Hawthorne, occur the following lines:

"At this point Mr. Bailey, of Texas, arose and immediately lifted the discussion from the level of dictionary definitions to that of statesmanship. He challenged the right of the federal government to interfere in what should (as he contended) be a matter proper to the state police.

"I believe the rascal who sells poisons to the public is a public enemy, and should be sent to prison; but I believe that state and not federal law should be the instrument. . . . I say that one criminal state prosecution would do more to correct abuses than any bureau. . . . Take the postoffice; no such despot was ever legally created as the postmaster general. He can destroy any man's business simply by saying, on his private responsibility, that it shall stop; and there is no appeal for the victim, save to the officer who condemned him. . . . It is un-American. . . . The entire federal government cannot take away a man's horse; but a single individual may take away his business and reputation without recourse or compensation."

How much longer will the press of this country remain silent in the face of such facts?

A VISIT TO THE PRISONER.

On Monday, March 26, I had a short interview with my father. His health has suffered from the confinement and prison diet, but in spirit he is cheerful and hopeful. He feels, however, that if present conditions continue he will probably not outlive his term of imprisonment. There is a great deal of consumption in the Joliet penitentiary. He is confined in his cell nearly all the time, and his cell-mate, who sleeps in the lower bunk with his head about three feet below father's, coughs a great deal of the time. I did not understand whether he is a consumptive or not.

Father was compelled to submit to vaccination—the first time in his life in which he has undergone that operation. Because of trouble resulting from the vaccination, and the coughing of his cell-mate, he has not yet been able to obtain proper sleep. The general prison diet is better than in some other prisons, but is not suited to him, and he cannot have the food to which he is accustomed and which consists principally of fruit. The prisoners are permitted to eat while they are talking to their visitors, but can carry nothing to their cells. He had eaten nothing that day, hoping we would come. We took him some of the finest apples (his favorite fruit) that we could find. It was hard to be obliged to bring away all he could not eat while talking, when we knew he so needed them.

He wrote a letter, about two weeks ago, but it was not permitted to be mailed, owing, I understand, to the fact that those through whose hands it passed considered that it contained criticisms of the management of the prison. Unless he obtains a special permit from the deputy warden he cannot write another letter until five weeks from the date of that letter.

He is allowed to receive magazines and books that are not considered improper by the officials through whose hands they pass. He has received "The Public," "Tomorrow Magazine," "Everybody's," Shaw's "Plays Pleasant and Unpleasant," the Chicago "Daily Tribune" and the "Record-Herald," and other publications. He cannot receive LUCIFER, the Chicago "Daily Journal" is barred, and I understand the "American" and "Examiner" are classed with the "Journal." LUCIFER is barred because of its criticism of acts of government officials.

He has no employment, and is not allowed to have paper or pencil in his possession.

Some of the letters sent to him have not been delivered, owing to the fact that the writers have criticised the acts of officials or have attempted to "make a hero" of the prisoner. The prison officials feel that they have had nothing to do with sending prisoners there, but that, once there, all are to be considered equally guilty. The letters which are not delivered to him now will be retained and given to him on his release.

Letters from the following named friends were addressed to the prison and received by him: W. C. Cope, Otto Wettstein, Thomas J. Griffiths, George B. Wheeler, Thaddeus B. Wakeman, J. R. Price, M. D.; Mollie A. Price, A. Wangemann, Mattie Day Haworth, Loretta Mann Hammond, Viola Richardson, Ed. W. Chamberlain, Henry Bool, George Harman, Annie E. Parkhurst, Sara Crist Campbell, Emma Greene, C. N. Greene, C. J. Zeitinger, Ella Slater, H. W. Booser, Leonard D. Abbott, Lily White, Mrs. A. C. Zimmerman, Walter Hurt, Frank Weller, Dr. Levenson, M. Florence Johnson, Mrs. Katherine Buck, Mrs. H. M. Lyndall, Parker H. Sercombe.

Letters forwarded through LUCIFER office: S. J. Gill, James Myers, Parker H. Sercombe, the Rev. John V. Potts, Mrs. Olive Clifford, Allen Haddock, Ollie M. Steedman, Joshua Harman, Eugene V. Debs, Walter Hurt, Louis F. Post, William Lloyd Garrison.

The foregoing is a list of the letters which father handed to me. It is possible that he did not give me all that he had received. Some that I sent him were not included.

I have received a considerable number of letters which I have not forwarded. Some I wanted to copy before sending, and will send later. Others I did not forward because I felt sure they would not be given to him.

He is very glad to receive letters. In writing please let the penmanship be as clear and distinct as possible. Do not ask questions which require reply, as he cannot answer. Such questions should be sent to this office. All letters received will be acknowledged from time to time in this way. I hope no one will be deterred from writing by the limitations to expression which it is necessary to observe. Now that reading is practically his only occupation letters will probably be more welcome than at any other time in his life.

I believe that this statement of facts is sufficient, and that comment is unnecessary. I have no desire to make an appeal for sympathy. Understanding as I do the feeling of love and admiration for him which so many of the readers of these lines share with me, I will only express the hope that those feelings will be embodied, not in a "suffering sympathy," but in a "working sympathy." Life is sweet to Moses Harman. Liberty of body is dear to him. But the work to which his life is devoted is more to him than life itself.

LILLIAN HARMAN.

NOTABLE ACTION AT THE SUNRISE CLUB.

NEW YORK CITY, March 19, 1906.

At the one hundred and seventy-third dinner of the Sunrise Club, tonight at the Café Boulevard, the opening speaker was Theodore Schroeder, and his subject, "From Sacramental to Secular Marriage." The topic suggested to Horace Traubel, editor of "The Conservator," that it would be timely to enter the club's protest against the persecution and imprisonment of Moses Harman. Accordingly, the chairman, the writer of this, very briefly referred to the facts and the vital issues involved, leaving to Mr. Traubel the task of showing to whom the reference was made and the immediate connection of Mr. Harman's work with the theme of the evening's discussion.

Whereupon, astonishing as it may seem, there were calls of "Who is Moses Harman?" and "What is it all about?" After Mr. Traubel had expressed his conviction that there should not be any man or woman in any progressive society in America under the necessity of asking such questions, the chairman gave a short sketch of Mr. Harman's fight of a quarter of a century for the opportunity to calmly and sanely investigate the relations of the sexes. He outlined the various prosecutions which LUCIFER and its editor have undergone, and gave a succinct description of the administrative process as it has developed in the postoffice during the past few years. Then he called for a rising vote of protest, which was given with practical unanimity.

To put the protest and condemnation on record, Mr. Benjamin Franklin offered the preamble and resolution which follow, and which, stenographically taken by Mrs. Bertha W. Howe, went through with a rush:

"WHEREAS, Moses Harman, editor of LUCIFER, of the city of Chicago, has been incarcerated in the penitentiary by reason of the fact of the exercise of the right of an American citizen in publishing his views on questions of importance to the present day and generation; therefore, be it

"Resolved, By the members of the Sunrise Club of the city of New York, that we, as a liberal organization, protest against the high-handed and autocratic measures of the postal department and other departments of the government, and that we look upon these actions as a menace to the rights of free speech and a free press."

Mrs. Florence Fairview Wieland said that talk was well; but that it needed tangible backing, and led with a banknote. The plate was passed and the sum of \$27.15 collected for the defense of LUCIFER and to help in the enlightenment of the people.

Mrs. Marie Halpern suggested that all present affix their signatures to the resolution, and at the close of the meeting Mrs. Grace Potter obtained the list inclosed, about two-fifths of the diners having left before the collector could reach them.

EDWIN C. WALKER.

244 West One Hundred and Forty-third street.

Sixty names were signed to the Sunrise Club dinner resolution.

TOMORROW MAGAZINE FOR APRIL.

"The Culturist," of Cincinnati, Walter Hurt, editor, having consolidated with "To-Morrow Magazine," of Chicago, the combination of these two "think" publications has resulted in a most unusual output for April. Besides adding Walter Hurt and Margaret Warren Springer to its regular editorial staff, "To-Morrow" has also acquired Charles A. Sandburg, whose "Views and Reviews" and an illustrated "Appreciation of Jack London" are notable contributions.

"To-Morrow" continues the serials, "The History of Human Marriage," by Lida Parce Robinson; "Rights," by Herman Kuehn; "High Finance in Mexico," by Parker H. Sercombe, and "Reservations and Government Aid to Indians," by Dr. Carlos Montezuma. In the "Culturist" section, by Walter Hurt, is published a notable personal letter from Eugene V. Debs, and an "Appreciation of Moses Harman," with frontispiece portrait (Moses Harman and grandchild); "Plutocracy's Murderous Plot," referring to the Colorado miners on trial for murder; "Our Judicial Criminals," etc. The regular comments by the editors will be of unusual interest to thinkers, and contain "The Need of Friends," "The Psychology of Hate," "Human Interest in the Marriage of Others," "The Author-Hero of the New Revolution" (Thomas W. Lawson), "The Cause and Cure," "The Human World Problems." Altogether, the combined "To-Morrow" and "Culturist" for April is a hot shot into the world of thought and will find many an echo in humanity's progress towards democracy among those who take the time to understand. "To-Morrow Magazine," 2238 Calumet avenue, Chicago. One dollar a year, ten cents on all news stands.

A NEW RADICAL MAGAZINE.

"Mother Earth" for March is the initial number of a new magazine, published by Emma Goldman and edited by Emma Goldman and Max Baginski. "The aim of 'Mother Earth,'" we are told, "will be to present to its readers every phase of liberal thought and activity throughout the world, whether in the realm of pure literature, in the whirlpool of revolutionary struggle, or in the somber depths of silent preparation. Recognition is given, however, to the newly awakened desire on the part of vast numbers of those, on the outside of the liberal movement, to know the meaning of the universal unrest in which the whole world shares, but which is directed by scattered groups of workers. 'Mother Earth,' therefore, will be at once informing and educative, and to these ends will enlist the services of the leaders of both thought and action in the various parts of the world."

Among the articles in this number are "The Tragedy of Woman's Emancipation," by Emma Goldman; "Without Government," by Max Baginski; "Comstockery," John R. Coryell; "Don Quixote's Revenge," Turgeneff; "The British Elections and Labor Parties," H. Kelly; "The Mine Owners' Revenge."

"Mother Earth" is a valuable addition to the literature of advanced thought and should receive a hearty welcome. Ten cents a copy, \$1 a year. Address Emma Goldman, Box 217, Madison Square Station, New York City.

VARIOUS VOICES.

Full name and address of writers in this department can generally be obtained on application to the editor.

We are always glad to receive calls from friends visiting the city. Take the Lake street elevated, stop at Ashland avenue, walk one block east, then one block north. Or take Fulton street electric car west and stop at St. John's place, alighting in front of our house. The Lake street electric and Paulina street cars also pass within a block of our residence.

AMY ODELL, St. Paul, Kan.—I inclose 25 cents and should like to help circulate the Wakeman Letter. You have my sympathy—also my congratulations.

ANNIE LILLIAN SWETT, Cedar Rapids, Iowa.—I am sending you 25 cents to pay for some literature for distribution. I would send you as many dollars if I could. I will willingly distribute anything you may send me.

DR. T. MORRIS, Columbus, Ohio.—I received a copy of LUCIFER No. 1061 and was sorry to see that in this so-called land of the free a man should be placed in prison for nothing. This seems hard, and yet it is one of the means toward an end, and that end will be the destruction of a form of government that will permit such an outrage. I remember having seen a copy of the issue that was con-

fascated by the postoffice department and there was nothing in it that any clear, clean minded man could find fault with. I feel that it is and has been just a matter of spite work, caused by fanatical prejudice. Find enclosed \$1. Send me the worth of one-half of it in Wakeman's Letters and LUCIFER for the rest.

O. CARLTON, 402 Fifth avenue, Seattle, Wash.—I am pleased to be a reader and student of LUCIFER and wish to meet friends of this paper. A LUCIFER club is what is needed for strength. I inclose 50 cents on subscription and 50 cents for sample copies of LUCIFER and copies of the Wakeman Letter.

DR. S. A. WEST, Rock Port, Mo.—The latest copy of LUCIFER has just been read and passed on to a friend. It is good. Will you please mail me another copy? Also send a copy to each of the names on inclosed list. The picture of your father is splendid. By all means keep it in LUCIFER. There is not a reader of the little paper but will welcome this move and be proud of it.

ED HAYES, Brooklyn, N. Y.—For the inclosed dollar kindly send me a photograph of your noble father. He is to be congratulated. At 75 he is at the fore-front of the battle for human freedom. He is alive and the red blood of the struggle flows in his veins; whereas the majority of men of 50 are gaping their lives away in futile, idiotic and stupid pursuit of money, without an idea or thought above the most sordid and mean affairs. You should be proud.

MRS. BERTHA MOORE, Portland, Ore.—Here is to the man who dares to stand for the right; who dares to face prison bars for Freedom's sake. Victory already is weaving for him a crown. Hundreds are now reading the LIGHT-BEARER who never read it before, and many are hearing of Harman, America's Grand Old Man, who never before heard of him. American spirit will rouse; Comstock shall not write our epitaph. Enclosed is \$1, for which please send me copies of the Wakeman Letter.

E. J. ERNST, Olathe, Kan.—The old Labor Exchange still keeps racing about in my mind. I often feel like starting up the "Progressive Thought" again. I also think of writing for LUCIFER, but keep putting it off. I think short letters, with full names and addresses, would be an interesting feature of the paper.

[We give full name and address when we have reason to believe that such publicity is not objectionable to the writer of the letter. But when in doubt as to the wishes of the writer we think it best to omit the name.]

ADELINE CHAMPNEY, Cleveland, Ohio.—Here are a few stamps, representing the distribution of a few of the Wakeman Letter. The extra copies of LUCIFER No. 1061 came to hand. I am trying to put them in the hands of people who will read them.—I am glad to see that Louis F. Post is on the right side, and his articles are good, too. His influence ought to count for much, for his known disagreement with the ideas advocated by LUCIFER make his championship of Harman and LUCIFER in the fight with the censorship more significant, and should call the attention of people who are not even interested in the sex movement.—Emma Goldman gave two fine lectures in this city last week. One was given in German, the other in English, and she had good audiences both evenings. I hope that some of those "who came to scoff, remained to admire," or at least to ponder. Emma is much broader than I expected to find her. I am delighted with her. The initial number of her magazine, "Mother Earth," promises well. I hope it will have a large circulation. "The Tragedy of Woman's Emancipation" is excellent.—I am anxious to hear from your father, and to know how he bears up under his imprisonment. Of course I know I cannot hear from him personally, but you will let us know all that can be told the public about his health, etc. I feel that he has gone to jail for me. It is my battle he is fighting, and I wish I could do more to help along the work. I shall try to write him often. That is the least I can do to show my appreciation. You say the letters "pass through the hands of the chaplain"; does that mean that the chaplain reads all letters? If so, I think this ought to prove a liberal education for the chaplain. Perhaps he may awaken to a saving sense of his position yet.

[All letters are opened and presumably read before being delivered to prisoners. Friends should avoid criticisms of officials of the government or of the prison, for such references would probably prevent receipt of the letter by the prisoner.]

OUR DESPOTIC POSTAL CENSORSHIP.

(CONTINUED FROM PAGE 487.)

"Man and Superman." I am also informed that your department has sustained this action of the Chicago postmaster.

As your decision constitutes a precedent by which the Chicago postmaster, as he has informed me relative to your decisions in similar cases heretofore, will be governed in future cases, will you oblige me with the following information:

1. Has your department decided that LUCIFER, of October 12, is unmailable, and if so, for what cause?
2. Is it because on page ... that paper names and tells where to obtain any unmailable book or books?
3. Is it because of its quotation on page ... from Bernard Shaw's "Man and Superman"?
4. If "The Public" in commenting upon this decision of your department were to reproduce the said catalogue of books, or the said quotation from Bernard Shaw's "Man and Superman," would the postmaster at Chicago be required to consider this decision of your department in the LUCIFER case as a precedent and accordingly to exclude that issue of "The Public" from the mails?

I make this request as responsible editor of "The Public," for the purpose of ascertaining to what extent, under precedents made by your department, I shall be at liberty, in criticizing your decision in the LUCIFER case, to state the facts, without subjecting "The Public" to exclusion from the mails by your department.

To this inquiry we received the following response from the office of the first assistant postmaster general:

I beg to acknowledge receipt of your letter of the 20th instant, to the postmaster general, in reference to the publication LUCIFER.

In reply to your inquiry you are informed that the postmaster at Chicago was instructed to decline to accept for mailing copies of LUCIFER, of the issue of October 12, 1905, for the reason that such number, which was submitted to the department, contained matter of an obscene character.

As you were advised under date of the 13th ultimo in reference to an earlier issue of LUCIFER, it is not practicable for the department to attempt to point out all the offensive passages upon which the exclusion of the issue from the mails was based, nor can the department undertake to state what would or would not be unmailable, in advance of the matter being actually presented for transmission in the mails.

A redaction of this correspondence also to questions and answers produces the following rather remarkable result:

Question: Does the department exclude the issue of the paper in question because it "names and tells where to obtain any unmailable book or books"?

Answer: "It is not practicable for the department to attempt to point out all the offensive passages upon which the exclusion of the issue from the mails is based."

Question: Is it because of the quotation from Bernard Shaw's "Man and Superman"?

Answer: "It is not practicable for the department to attempt to point out all the offensive passages upon which the exclusion of the issue from the mails is based."

Question: If "The Public" were "to reproduce the said catalogue of books, or the said quotation from Bernard Shaw's 'Man and Superman,' would the postmaster at Chicago be required to consider this decision as a precedent and accordingly to exclude that issue of 'The Public' from the mails?"

Answer: The department cannot undertake "to state what would or would not be unmailable in advance of the matter being actually presented for transmission in the mails."

Now, why was it impracticable for the department to state whether or not the exclusion of LUCIFER was because it printed the names and places for procuring certain books? The department was not asked "to point out all offensive passages."

And why was it impracticable for the department to state whether or not the paper in question was excluded because of its quotation from "Man and Superman"? To do this it was not necessary "to point out all offensive passages."

Finally, why couldn't the department undertake to inform us whether the postmaster at Chicago would be required to consider the decision in the LUCIFER case as a precedent? What is the meaning of refusals by the department to state in advance of mailing whether matter excluded from the mail when published by one periodical would be unmailable if published by another? This last question almost answers itself.

II.

We have now proved our assertions. But that there may be no reasonable question of our having done so, let us summarize the assertions and the proof in support of them.

First. We have proved by the foregoing correspondence that any periodical is subject to exclusion from the mails as a purveyor of obscenity, upon the mere arbitrary order of administrative post-office officials.

Second. We have proved, also by the foregoing correspondence, that exclusion orders are made by the postoffice department ostensibly in accordance with its own rulings as to what constitutes obscenity, and that these rulings, though treated as precedents by postmasters, are kept profoundly secret by the department.

Third. We have proved, by reference to a previous article on this general subject, which is too lengthy to be reproduced here, that the courts hold decisions of the postmaster general in these matters to be absolutely beyond the power of the judiciary to override or restrain, even though he decides without evidence and in manifest bad faith.

Fourth. We have proved by the above correspondence, supplemented now by the best testimony possible, in view of the necessity the department imposes upon us of proving the negative of an issue on which it holds the affirmative and possesses all the affirmative evidence, if there be any, that in practice the department does exclude from the mails for obscenity periodicals which in fact are not obscene. The correspondence proves the first part of this contention—namely, that the department excludes periodicals alleged to contain obscene articles. As to the second and essential part of the contention—namely, that the articles are in fact not obscene—the department refuses to indicate the decisive facts, which are within its own control and in the nature of things cannot be known to outsiders. The several articles indicated above by the Chicago postmaster as cause for exclusion are clearly not obscene. The fact that the department refuses to particularize should raise a reasonable presumption that there is nothing which it can particularize. And in support of this presumption we now positively testify, after reading the excluded papers through, that they in fact contain no word, phrase or thought which can with any show of reason be characterized as obscene.

Fifth. It is not necessary to prove that these circumstances afford dangerous opportunities for corruption in the postoffice department. When the law permits postal officials to exclude from the mails any periodical, arbitrarily in their own discretion, with no appeal to the courts, upon the bare pretense that they contain obscenity, but without any requirement that the alleged obscenity be particularized with sufficient definiteness to permit of a judgment upon the good faith of the exclusion, and when the department passes upon the question not only arbitrarily, but in secret, the opportunities for secret corruption are so enormous that only the corruptible official in the place for corrupting possibilities is necessary to produce a regime of corruption.

We submit, then, that we have established all that in this article we set out to prove. Any periodical may be peremptorily excluded from the mails as a purveyor of obscenity, though it contains nothing obscene, and this upon the mere order of administrative postal officials; exclusion orders are made in alleged accordance with secret precedents, the limitations of which are withheld from publishers seeking to adapt their editorial rights to postal rulings; the courts declare themselves powerless to interfere, even though exclusions be made without evidence and in manifest bad faith; the postoffice department does in fact in this arbitrary manner exclude from the mails as obscene, periodicals which in fact are not obscene. Therefore, as the law now stands, it affords a degree of opportunity for corrupt discrimination and oppression which it is unsafe to repose in any official and which ought to be guarded against by Congress.

III.

The remedy for this fungus growth upon the postal service, a service originally intended only for a national convenience, but now turned into a national police system which operates through irresponsible "administrative process" and from a "star chamber" tribunal, lies with Congress.

Shall the right to mail service in the United States, now become a necessity of the common life, depend upon the caprice, the bigotry or the corruptibility of one man at the head of a Washington department or his subordinate at the head of a bureau?

That question is distinctly raised.

The courts have answered, Yes. What has Congress to say?—*The Public (Chicago).*

MISCELLANEOUS.

Bas Relief Medallions of Moses Harman.

Bas relief medallions of the bust of Moses Harman, size 9 by 14 inches (oval), the work of La Verne F. Wheeler, a well-known Chicago artist, can be had at the following prices: Plain white, \$1; old ivory, \$1.50; plain bronze, \$2; Etruscan bronze, \$2.50. Thirty-five cents additional for boxing and shipping. Send orders to LA VERNE F. WHEELER, 3323 Michigan avenue, Chicago, Ill.

If these figures correspond with the number printed on the wrapper of your Lucifer, your subscription expires with this number.
If a copy of Lucifer fails to reach you, please order by number or date.

ANNOUNCEMENTS.

THE SOCIAL SCIENCE LEAGUE holds public meetings every Sunday night at 8 o'clock in Room 913 Masonic Temple. Free discussion after each lecture. Lucifer on sale at meetings.

THE CHICAGO SOCIETY OF ANTHROPOLOGY holds regular meetings Sunday afternoons in Corinthian Hall, seventeenth floor Masonic building. Meetings open at 2:30. Free discussion. Lucifer on sale at meetings.

THE SPENCER-WHITMAN CENTER. Liberal discourses. A church of constructive Liberalism. Seats free. Every Sunday, 8 p. m., at Fraternity (Dewey) Hall, 70 East Adams street, Chicago. Also lectures and discussions every Sunday and Thursday evenings, 8 p. m., at headquarters, 2223 Calumet avenue, Chicago.

THE MANHATTAN LIBERAL CLUB meets every Friday evening at 220 East Fifteenth street, New York, at 8 o'clock. E. C. Walker, president. Lucifer for sale at meetings.

HUGH O. PENTECOST lectures every Sunday morning at 11 o'clock at Lyric Hall, Sixth avenue, near Forty-second street, New York. Lucifer for sale at meetings.

THE BROOKLYN PHILOSOPHICAL ASSOCIATION—Meetings held every Sunday afternoon, at 3 o'clock, in Long Island Business College, South Eighth street, between Bedford and Driggs avenues, Brooklyn, N. Y.

FRIENDSHIP LIBERAL LEAGUE, Philadelphia, Pa., meets every Sunday for lectures and debates upon all subjects of interest to humanity. The place of meeting is 715 North Broad street, and the time is 2:30 and 7:30 p. m. The seats are free and everybody is welcome. George Longford, secretary.

LOS ANGELES LIBERAL CLUB meets every Sunday evening at Mammoth Hall, 517 South Broadway. Lectures and debates. Liberal literature for free distribution. Admission free. Mrs. Eleanor Freemott, secretary.

BOOKS AND PAMPHLETS.

Our Advancing Postal Censorship.

BY LOUIS F. POST.

An extremely powerful review of the administrative process, which is rapidly Russifying these United States. Contains a correspondence with the postal department in reference to the attempted suppression of LUCIFER, and Mr. Post's conclusions therefrom.

"The confiscation by postal clerks of any publication, for any cause, without specific charges, without opportunity to the publisher to be heard, without the verdict of a jury, without appeal, without any of the ordinary safeguards of personal rights and private property, and consequently without any assurance of guilt, is an ominous fact. No matter how objectionable or even dangerous a paper's teachings may seem to the censors, no matter how offensive its language in their estimation, so palpable an invasion of the commonest rights of citizenship is a direct menace to the independent press of the country."

Price, 3c each; 25c a dozen.

M. HARMAN, 500 Fulton street, Chicago, Ill.

Administrative Process of the Postal Department.

A LETTER TO THE PRESIDENT, BY THADDEUS BURR WAKEMAN.

This is a most effective "missionary document" relative to the attempted suppression of free speech by the postal censorship. It contains half-tone portraits of the author and of Moses Harman. We want this letter distributed as widely and as effectively as possible, and as some who might be able to distribute it may not be able to buy we have felt reluctant to set a price on it. Let such not hesitate to order any quantity desired, even though unable to send money. For those who can afford to help bear the expense of publication, the price is 5 cents a copy, or 25 cents a dozen.

M. HARMAN, 500 Fulton street, Chicago, Ill.

President Roosevelt's Gospel of Doom.

BY LADY FLORENCE DIXIE.

In this open letter the authors shows that large families are injurious to the mother, injurious to the child, and injurious to the community. She attributes Mr. Roosevelt's views on the subject to the influence of "Hebraic dispensations, effete and age-worn superstition." Price 5 cents.

M. HARMAN, 500 Fulton St., Chicago.

ANARCHISM, Socialism, Religion, Atheism, etc., combined, and principles outlined that will establish Liberty and Justice in Use—Natural Law; pamphlet. Send 10c silver to H. S., Box 691, San Francisco, Cal.

BUSINESS AND PROFESSIONAL CARDS.

OTTO WETTSTEIN,

THE LIBERAL MAIL-ORDER JEWELER.

Now permanent at No. 110 N. Kensington av., La Grange, Cook Co., Ill. Can save you 10 to 20 per cent on Watches, Diamonds or anything in the Jeweler's Line. Write me and receive prices and my great little tract, "Theism in the Crucible," free.

J. H. GREER, M. D.,

52 DEARBORN ST., CHICAGO.

Office Hours—9 a. m. to 6 p. m.; Wednesdays and Saturdays, 9 a. m. to 8 p. m.; Sundays, 9 a. m. to 12 m. Telephone Randolph 42.

DR. OGILVIE RICE,

DENTIST.

1556 MILWAUKEE AVE., COR. WESTERN, CHICAGO.
Telephone West 141.

PHILIP G. PEABODY,

ATTORNEY AND COUNSELLOR AT LAW,
15 COURT SQUARE ROOM 61,
BOSTON, MASS.